

DISCLAIMER

This electronic version of an SCC order is for informational purposes only and is not an official document of the Commission. An official copy may be obtained from the [Clerk of the Commission, Document Control Center](#).

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

AT RICHMOND, DECEMBER 20, 2000

APPLICATION OF

VERIZON VIRGINIA INC. f/k/a
BELL ATLANTIC - VIRGINIA, INC.

CASE NO. PUC990101

For approval of its Network
Services Interconnection Tariff,
S.C.C.-Va.-No. 218

ORDER ACCEPTING ADDITIONAL
TARIFF REVISION ON INTERIM BASIS
AND PROVIDING FOR FURTHER COMMENT

The collocation services tariff filed by Verizon Virginia Inc. ("Verizon Virginia" or "the Company") f/k/a Bell Atlantic - Virginia, Inc., and approved by the State Corporation Commission ("Commission") on an interim basis on June 25, 1999, and further approved on an interim basis after revisions filed September 17, 1999, and May 17, 2000, has been revised again pursuant to a tariff filing by Verizon Virginia on November 21, 2000 ("November 21, 2000, Tariff Revision"). The proposed effective date of the November 21, 2000, Tariff Revision is December 21, 2000.

According to Verizon Virginia, the Company's collocation tariff is being amended to bring the tariff in compliance with the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") Order on

Reconsideration and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making in CC Docket No. 98-147 and Fifth Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket 96-98, adopted August 9, 2000, and Memorandum Opinion and Order in CC Docket No. 98-147, adopted and released November 7, 2000.

The Commission finds that the November 21, 2000, Tariff Revision should be accepted on an interim basis and that further comments should be accepted on the limited matter of whether the November 21, 2000, Tariff Revision complies with the FCC Orders above.

In addition, on October 20, 2000, Cavalier Telephone, LLC ("Cavalier"), filed a motion requesting that the Commission adopt the Staff's October 27, 1999, Report on an expedited basis and to investigate further certain issues raised by the Company's tariff.

Verizon Virginia filed a response on November 3, 2000, to Cavalier's motion. The Company requested that the Commission defer action on Cavalier's motion, noting that it and several CLECs were close to finalizing a settlement agreement governing all collocation rates and also resolving several non-price terms and conditions. The Company stated that within the next two weeks (by November 17, 2000) the parties to the settlement agreement would file a joint petition requesting that the

Commission approve it and adopt a revised collocation tariff.

No settlement agreement has been filed to date.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) Verizon Virginia's November 21, 2000, Tariff Revision is hereby approved on an interim basis, effective December 21, 2000, subject to refunds of collocation charges and/or modifications in terms and conditions.

(2) Verizon Virginia shall serve upon all parties having previously filed comments, as well as the Attorney General, copies of its November 21, 2000, Tariff Revision within ten (10) days from the date of this Order, if it has not already done so. Verizon Virginia shall promptly furnish a copy of its November 21, 2000, Tariff Revision to any person requesting a copy. Requests may be directed to Lydia R. Pulley, Vice President and General Counsel, Verizon Virginia Inc., 600 East Main Street, Suite 1100, Richmond, Virginia 23219-2441.

(3) On or before February 2, 2001, any interested party is granted leave to file comments on the November 21, 2000, Tariff Revision, consistent with the findings above. The scope of the comments should be limited to the tariff revisions and their compliance with the FCC rules.

(4) On or before January 8, 2001, Verizon Virginia shall file the settlement agreement referenced in its November 3, 2000, letter. If no such settlement has been reached, Verizon

shall instead file a detailed status report on the purported settlement agreement, which should include a clear explanation as to why such agreement has not been timely submitted as represented in its November 3, 2000, letter to the Commission.

(5) This matter is continued generally.